

ED 369 033

CS 011 296

AUTHOR Chandler, Paul Michael
 TITLE Wholistic Assessment of Proficient Second Language Readers.
 PUB DATE Dec 92
 NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference (42nd, San Antonio, TX, December 2-5, 1992).
 PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Discourse Analysis; English (Second Language); Higher Education; Holistic Evaluation; *Reading Processes; Reading Research; *Recall (Psychology); Second Language Learning; Student Evaluation
 IDENTIFIERS Expository Text; *Reading Behavior; Retelling; Text Factors; *Text Processing (Reading)

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the reading behaviors of proficient second language (L2) readers through their oral retellings. Subjects, 12 advanced English-as-a-Second-Language students who were native speakers of Spanish (10 from Spain, 2 from Central America), read two passages from a college-level expository text and gave two oral retellings which were then transcribed verbatim and analyzed. Various behaviors were used to relate readers' understanding of text, some text-dependent (main ideas/details and paraphrasing/summarization), others text-independent (intertextuality, verification, conclusions/predictions, critical assessment, and generalization), as well as several pragmatic/discourse features (pause mechanisms, backtracking/recycling, and language problem anomalies). Each retelling was assigned a richness rating for main ideas, supportive details, summarization, completeness, and coherence of message. Results indicated a fairly wide range of richness ratings. The amounts of idea units in the reading passages and the oral retellings were compared. Results indicated that all topics averaged similar amounts of recall. Findings suggest that passage length in studies of beginning and intermediate language learners should be examined to study readers' information processing abilities in a broad sense, since their performances may vary when there is more material to be processed into long term memory. (Three tables of data are included; a retelling assessment key and 21 references are attached.) (RS)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

Paul Michael Chandler, University of Hawaii at Manoa

National Reading Conference, San Antonio, TX
December 1992

European Languages and Literature
Moore Hall 483
University of Hawaii at Manoa
Honolulu, HI 96822
(808) 956-4176

WHOLISTIC ASSESSMENT OF PROFICIENT
SECOND LANGUAGE READERS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Paul Michael
Chandler*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinion stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Running head: Proficient L2 Readers

WHOLISTIC ASSESSMENT OF PROFICIENT SECOND LANGUAGE READERS

To broaden our understanding of how readers make meaning with text, we study readers of different levels during different reading events. Traditional forms of assessment often focus on the product of reading while verbal and written protocols allow us to draw closer to the mental processes used during reading. The purpose of this study has been to study the reading behaviors of proficient second language (L2) readers through their oral retellings in two separate reading events. The readers expected to provide oral retellings immediately after reading. By studying the oral retellings of advanced English as a Second Language (ESL) readers we gain insights into their processing, retrieval, and (re)organization of information (Feathers, et al. 1991). Thus, this study has searched for patterns and anomalies in the oral retellings of twelve proficient readers.

METHOD

Informants

The participants in this study were twelve advanced ESL students who are native speakers of Spanish (ten from Spain; two from Central America). All had either completed a university degree in English in their native country or had achieved a score of 560 or better on the TOEFL exam placing them at or near the level required for admittance to many university programs in the United States.

Materials

The reading passages used in this study are from Babbie's Understanding Sociology: A Context for Action (1982). It was assumed

that an expository college text published in English in the United States would be a reasonable source of material for proficient FL readers. The topics were: Culture, pp. 48-53; Socialization, pp. 82-86; and Bureaucracy, pp. 108-113. Passages of these lengths were chosen because advanced readers are expected to read longer texts. The Babbie text previously had been rated suitable for the 17 (Fry), 14 (SMOG) and 15 year (Chall) year of study (Townsend & Wilkie, 1983).

The reading passages were divided into meaningful segments of prose consisting of a noun, verb, or prepositional phrase (Bernhardt, 1983). This established a set of ideas units with which to compare the ideas units found in the retellings during the post-taxonomy analysis.

Instructions

The researcher met with each reader in a university office or private home according to reader preference and convenience. After completing questionnaires with personal information about their educational and cultural background--especially their reading habits in Spanish and English--the readers were set at ease with approximately five minutes of informal conversation.

The instructions were to orient the reader while not setting rigid guidelines as to the length, structure, format, or content of the retelling (Chandler, Mustapha, Ono & Torruella, 1989; p. 3). The formal instructions were: "Take your time! After completing the reading put it aside and explain to me what the reading was about. Give as complete a retelling as possible. You may give the retelling in English or Spanish. It makes no difference, since I am not concerned with your speaking abilities." Because the reading process may be affected by the designated task (Powell, 1988) I attempted to

make clear what was expected of the reader. By allowing them to give the retellings in Spanish or English it is hoped that the problem of dual-skill use has been eliminated (Swaffar, Arens & Byrnes, 1991). One person preferred to give her retellings in English: "It makes sense, because I read it in English."

To get a truer picture of each reader's comprehension, all were asked to provide oral retellings of two different reading passages. It is assumed that having two "snapshots" of readers' behaviors provides a more accurate overall picture of how they make meaning with text. Since only two participants were familiar with oral retelling, it also was important to get two retellings to offset any problems caused by lack of familiarity with the procedure.

Procedure

All participants read two passages from a college-level expository text and gave two oral retellings which were then transcribed verbatim. Unitizing and categorizing of data were performed (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) by repeatedly sifting the data to glean maximum insights about the processes used to make meaning with the text (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). A constant comparative analysis allowed the data to be read many times until no more meaningful patterns emerged (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; O'Brian & Stewart, 1990). Relevant categories were given meaningful labels and were considered saturated when no new instances suggesting finer distinctions could be found (O'Brian & Stewart, 1990). Thus, the reading behaviors have been drawn from the data rather than imposed through a previously determined text template. The triangulation procedures used to achieve validity (Denzin, 1978) checked emerging patterns across readers and between each reader's retellings,

as well as with educational and cultural background information gathered through questionnaires and post-reading interviews.

A miscue type of analysis of retellers' negotiation with meaning examined the pragmatic/discourse features used in their retellings. The oral negotiation by the retellers reflects the mental processes occurring during the retrieval and organization of information. By including all elements of the oral retellings, this analysis differs from previous studies, offering additional insights into the behaviors used during the reading event.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Verbatim transcriptions retained all the meaning and pragmatic/discourse features the readers had included in the retellings. Various behaviors were used to relate readers' understanding of text, some text-dependent, others text-independent, as well as several pragmatic/discourse features.

Emergent Patterns

A taxonomy was developed based in part on that of the preliminary study which was in turn based on the transcribed oral retellings of proficient adult informants. The behaviors were confirmed by the researcher and a graduate assistant to check reliability (91%). The first set of features mentioned are text-based. These portions of the retellings seemed to fall into distinct types.

First of all, there were elements which seemed to be of greater importance to the reteller, either in that they were presented as a sort of blanket or thesis statement, or in that they were discussed as an overall concept to be explained and supported with further detail. These broad or general ideas have been designated main ideas, while the

elaboration, explanation, and examples given in support of these main ideas have been grouped together as detail. (Examples are provided below.) The types of behaviors which have been included in the detail category include defining, describing, listing information, and giving examples. It is through such behaviors that the retellers added detail to their explication of the main ideas. Other terms have been used to refer to main ideas (e.g., key concepts, superordinate ideas) and supportive and elaborative details (e.g., subordinate ideas). Flower (1990) found that college students in the United States sometimes use a writing strategy labeled "gist & list" which is similar to the way some retellers add detail, examples, definition, and elaboration to their oral retellings.

The following examples include main ideas and supportive details. Each example is identified by reteller number and whether the retelling was the first or second one by the reteller. Thus, 10-1 is an example taken from the first retelling of reteller number ten. Translations are mine. (See Appendix for summary of text- and reader-based features.)

Main ideas

10-1: It starts out talking about the different types of societies in the historical evolution.

02-1: Then after that he goes on to talk about resocialization and also changes and results this process brings about.

Details

12-2: The small child is also socializing its parents.

12-2: Later come the steamboats.

When readers used their own words to talk about text-based elements they paraphrased or summarized information from the text. These behaviors were placed in a category called paraphrasing/summarization. This type of text-based information was fairly close to the information found in the text. Information in the

retelling which was inaccurate or false was understood to belong in another category.

In the case of proficient readers it seems that unless there is a problem with some reading-related behavior (e.g., the reader only lists facts, the reader has difficulty putting things in her own words) these differences may simply reflect reading or retelling style. The first example below summarizes a paragraph of the text about Weber's definition of bureaucracy. Originally, the mention of Weber's theory was included in the "details" category, but it was later changed to the "summarization" category because the reteller goes beyond simply mentioning Weber's name. In the latter examples we find information from the text which has been put into the words of the reteller. The third maintains wording that is very close to the original text.

Paraphrasing/Summarization

04-1: Then, later it gives you Weber's view that, on the other hand, gives you a positive perspective, OK?.

02-1: So when there is a war, you need soldiers and it doesn't matter if they are black or white.

02-2: If you deviate from the rules, then you are to blame.

Reader-Based Features

The retellings included elements which, rather than being drawn directly from the text, reflected varying amounts of personal involvement with the meaning being created. These have been termed reader perspective items and include several behaviors listed below. Besides involving a personal aspect these behaviors reflected retellers' inclusion of different types and amounts of prior knowledge.

Information related to the topic, but based on other sources was called intertextuality. Examples include the direct mention of familiarity with ideas or related information and the inclusion of quotes,

anecdotes, sayings, or other widely-known information. Sources of the information may be texts, authors, discussions, lectures, etc.

Intertextuality

04-2: I have read that before.

05-1: Well, there are different ways of seeing the same thing. Or rather, like what you and I had said before, different ways of looking at things. [reference to comments made prior to reading].

At times retellers seemed to agree or disagree with the author or text about certain information. In such cases the retellers pondered, repeated or questioned information or terminology in the reading. Some readers did not exhibit such behavior, however, this does not necessarily imply neutrality; they may have chosen other behaviors or avoided these by sticking closer to the text. This category was labeled verification. Flower (1990) has noted a similar behavior by college students during writing tasks which she describes as "true, I agree" (TIA). In such cases the students find and write about information with which they agree or with which they are familiar, including it in the new text they are creating. Examples include agreement, pondering, or questioning.

Verification

02-1: There was something there, if I could have the text I could show it to you. There was something there which I thought was very ambiguous.

10-1: Oh, what was that about norms?

04-1: That I do understand, well, uh, what it means.

In other instances readers drew conclusions or made predictions based on their knowledge and beliefs, rather than relying solely on the text. In these behaviors retellers took information from the text in order to hypothesize or make further stipulations about it. Examples of these behaviors were categorized as conclusions/predictions. The

reteller seems to make a decision about certain information based on prior knowledge and opinion, adding a personal tone to the event. They varied from guesses about the origin of the text to conclusions about actual content to predictions or conclusions drawn from ideas discussed in the passages.

Conclusions/Predictions

02-1: [criticizing the author's example] If it had been a paper written by one of us, that's OK, but it's something which has been published.

05-2: ... because this article is written by an American.

05-1: Let's say, man sees himself, re, replaced by machines.

In some cases, the reader seemed to engage the author or to analyze information mentioned in the reading in a critical but personal fashion, which reflected personal opinions and prior knowledge. These elements usually were evaluative in nature or attempted to assess elements of the text, and thus, are referred to as critical assessment.

Critical Assessment

07-2: The peers themselves affect the child's conduct because they directly show him his weakpoints.

07-2: [Resocialization] can affect, bring about change at the societal level.

02-1: I got a bit confused with all the references he makes to war. I mean social change is much more complex than that.

The final subcategory of reader perspective is generalization.

The reader has taken information from the text, processed it along with prior knowledge, and made an inference or generalization. Since these were colored by personal opinion, bias, experience, and prior knowledge, they belong in the reader perspective portion of the taxonomy. These examples illustrate information based on reader inference in that they include information not found in the text.

Generalization

10-1: Power lies precisely with the people who have money.

12-1: And it's [bureaucracy's] all done through paperwork.

Other inferences appeared in the retellings. For example, Reader 9 relates "mores" with religious values even though this is never stated explicitly in the Socialization passage. He also stated, as did Reader 1, that the elders were the first leaders of early societies, just as they are today, making connections with the text's discussion of ancestor worship and the development of leadership roles in society. Reader 1 also talked about the existence of a patriarchy which was never mentioned in the reading. Reader 11 infers (rightly or wrongly) that the women's movement was caused by television, while the text simply discusses the changing role of women and how things have changed since television was invented. Reader 2 inferred that the two passages she read were by different authors, one she liked, the other she did not. In reality the passages are from the same author.

Pragmatic/Discourse Features

Retellings reflect patterns of mental processes used by readers. Different speech features are used, depending on the desired message, manner of speaking, and other factors such as nervousness, and topic familiarity. Thirty to fifty per cent of a speaker's discourse may involve pause mechanisms (Ponce, 1990) such as "digamos," "bueno," "pues" and "o sea." They are similar to English pause markers: "you know," "let's see," "then."

Pause mechanisms

The pragmatic/discourse features the twelve retellers used to develop their retellings were examined similarly to the processes used

to analyze oral reading miscues, by asking (1) if they make sense syntactically and semantically within the context, and (2) if they alter the meaning or direction of the retelling in some way. The behaviors studied may be referred to as pause mechanisms (PM). These are usually the mention of a word, partial word, sound or short phrase. The PM is often discarded or replaced when the reteller continues with the next organized thought. However, PMs may occur in a series. PMs are oral evidence that the reteller is involved in an on-going search pattern. PMs are uttered while the mind searches for information and organizes the next thought, much like the way a computer scans a diskette for information and sends it to a monitor or printer. Naturally, people use PMs to varying degrees allowing them to organize and build meaning. The mouth continues the dialogue as the mind sifts information. PMs should be studied further to see if they reflect other behaviors or strategies that occur during the meaning-making process. The most common PMs used by the retellers are included in the Appendix.

Pause mechanisms

01-1: So, then, depending on the...

03-2: And, also, well, in the last part...

05-2: Well, this article, more or less, well, it starts off defining what the system, what bureaucracy is in general.

06-1: If, he sees how, it's a stru, it's a way of organizing the structure of society.

Other observed PMs involved the recycling of information or backtracking to "revisit" a previously mentioned topic. Below, Reader 1 provides an example of backtracking wherein he leaves an incomplete thought hanging in order to state more information about the previous thought (i.e., he jumps from the idea of settling down, to talk more

about his previous topic, nomadism. Readers 4 and 9 returned to several ideas during their retelling.

Backtracking/recycling

01-2: [Even though they are not harvesting a lot from the land, they stay, and settle down.] Entonces tienen que, hay una especie de nomadismo, pero es más reducido. / Then they have to [incomplete thought], there is a type of nomadism, but it is reduced.

04-1: [Reader 4 returns to the term "negative" on five different occasions in her retelling of the bureaucracy passage; she refers to bureacucracy not being flexible at four different points in her retelling.]

09-1: [Reader 9 seems to list-and-gist (Flower, 1990) as he returns to the idea of the nomads settling down four different times; he refers to getting better harvests three times; and makes seven different references to values.]

The following example illustrates the difficulty in determining what referent the reteller had in mind. Since the Spanish pronoun "se" can stand for almost anything, there is no way of predicting from the limited context what the reader had in mind.

06-2: ...se verían muchos más tipos de trabajos debido a la mecanización. Se, la estructura de la sociedad cambia. / ...we would see many more types of jobs because of mechanization. ??, the structure of society changes.

The PM data revealed an interesting difference between the five men and seven women in the study. The men averaged 50.2 and the women only 36.3 pause mechanisms. It is quite possible that this notable difference is per chance. On the other hand, in a notably machista culture it is possible that a woman's manner of speaking may differ from a man's in some respects. I would speculate that since men may be used to "keeping the floor," they may develop more pause mechanisms for that purpose; women, who sometimes are attributed with a more cooperative, sharing-the-floor manner of conversing, may develop or use these features differently.

Self correction was common when using an English word in a retelling wherein a word, term or phrase from the English reading required some comment or linguistic adjustment (i.e., How do you say...?; I can't remember the exact term... ; I don't know the translation of...). These are categorized as anomalies since they do not fit perfectly into other categories. Yet they still belong to the set of pragmatic devices which FL speakers learn to use over time.

Since most of the anomalies involved the use of English words in Spanish retellings they were placed in this group. Several of the retellers used a few English terms in their retellings; their English is good enough to allow them to switch back and forth. In some cases the English word is closely related to U.S. culture (where the textbook was written). References to memory problems were included as anomalies since they did not fit in either the text-based or reader-based categories (i.e., I can't remember; I don't remember his name, etc.). These also reflect the processes of retrieval and organization of information and are a part of the meaning-negotiating process.

Language Problem Anomalies

02-2: He also talks about [] and all the butt-licking that goes on. [This may have been a miscue if she read the Spanish term lameculos (buttlicking) instead of the English term bootlicking which, while synonymous, is not exactly the same.

03-1: Coercive, and I myself don't, I don't know exactly what it means.

05-1: [This retelling includes several English words: gathering, replaced, thesis statement, summary.]

07-2: [She uses an unfamiliar Spanish term "adultezidad" to refer to adulthood. While not in my dictionary, this reteller has a degree in Sociology from Panama and may be using the term correctly within the realm of her field. She includes the following English words: handicap, mass media, army, over-socialized.

After completion of the taxonomy, each retelling was assigned a richness rating based on Irwin and Mitchell's scale (1983). Richness

ratings are used to value each retelling separately rather than comparing them to a template of the original text. The data were valued on a 1-5 scale (5 being the highest) for main ideas, supportive details, summarization, completeness, and coherence of message. In this study one extra point was given for retellings which included the reader's personal generalizations or conclusions. The points awarded were then averaged for a score between one and five for each retelling.

TABLE I - Richness rating of retellings (based on Irwin & Mitchell, 1983) listed by reteller number over the first and second retelling

| 01 | 02 | 03 | 04 | 05 | 06 | 07 | 08 | 09 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2.8 | 4.6 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 3.8 | 4.8 | 3.4 | 5.0 | 4.2 | 5.0 | 4.4 |
| 4.3 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 3.8 | 4.8 | 3.8 | 5.0 | 4.2 |

There was a fairly wide range of richness ratings (2.8-5.0). The lowest was for Reader 1 who had slept only a few hours. After a break, his second retelling was markedly improved. As might have been predicted, Reader 8, who had just passed the TOEFL exam and who had spent the least amount of time in an English speaking country, received fairly low richness ratings. Experience abroad may have been an important factor when we consider that Readers 6, 8, and 10, who also received lower ratings, had never spent time abroad. When we exclude Reader one's "sleepy" retelling the range of richness ratings is closer, 3.4-5.0.

Idea Units

The amounts of idea units in the reading passages and the oral retellings were compared. Pauses involving incomplete clauses were not counted, while those including entire noun, verb, or prepositional phrases were counted as idea units (Bernhardt, 1983). If we compare the number of idea units retold per reading (Table II) with the number

of idea units originally found in the reading passages, we find that the three reading topics averaged similar amounts of recall.

TABLE - II Idea Units Retold for each Reading

| Reading: | Culture | Bureaucracy | Socialization | |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------|---------------|--------|
| Idea units: | 306 | 201 | 274 | |
| | | | | TOTAL |
| Idea units retold | 499 | 565 | 658 | 1722 |
| Times retold | 7 | 8 | 9 | 24 |
| Means | $\bar{X} = 71.3$ | 70.6 | 73.1 | 71.75 |
| Idea Unit Spread: | 43-92 | 34-111 | 35-108 | 34-111 |

Also of interest is the fact that six readers in Spain mentioned a dislike for the reading on bureaucracy. While not necessarily significant, the amount of idea units mentioned in the retellings of that passage was slightly lower. But notice that the bureaucracy reading was also the shortest of the passages. The retellings, however, seem no different overall than the others provided by the readers.

Rather than idea units, Table III highlights the amount of text-based and reader-based reactions the retellers made about each passage. Again the total number of reactions was slightly lower for the reading on bureaucracy, regardless of whether it was the first or second reading. However, no apparent pattern existed regarding the order in which passages were read, nor in between the first and second retellings of each reteller.

TABLE III - Comparison of Readings

| Times Read | Order Read | Average # Reader-Based Reactions | Text-Based and Reactions |
|-------------------------------------|------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 4 Cult. | 1st | 42.5 | |
| 6 Bur. | 1st | 25.0 | |
| 2 Soc. | 1st | 39.5 | |
| 3 Cult. | 2nd | 36.3 | |
| 2 Bur. | 2nd | 37.5 | |
| 7 Soc. | 2nd | 33.4 | |
| Total: n = 24 | | 35.7 | |
| Cult. n = 7; Bur. n = 8; Soc. n = 9 | | | |

Total # of
Reactions
279 culture
225 bureaucracy
313 socialization

Implications

Passage length in studies of beginning and intermediate language learners should be examined to study readers' information processing abilities in a broad sense, since their performances may vary when there is more material to be processed into long term memory.

Also, texts which may require near native fluency have been studied less frequently. Lee & Musumeci (1988) looked at text type and reading skill together, attempting to find a match between the two for various levels of proficiency, basing their parallel hierarchy on the work of Child (1986) and Dandonoli (1986). However, Lee and Musumeci did not use what they term "level-five" texts which are believed to require near-native reading proficiency. This project is a beginning as we attempt to fill some of the research gap. By using lengthier expository texts, which were determined suitable for college students in the United States, the readers had an opportunity to process much more information and were able to so in a coherent manner.

The readers in this study presented fairly complete retellings, summarizing, predicting, and making inferences by using their prior knowledge. The set of oral retellings was heavily text-based as might be expected for an expository text. Further research should examine

the oral retellings of proficient readers using descriptive texts, narratives, passages about controversial topics, and readings selected by the readers themselves. Readers' selection of material is of special interest in view of Gradman and Hanania's (1990) finding that individual outside reading (in the second language) is the most important factor in successful L2 learning.

One weakness of this study is its lack of other wholistic devices through which to view readers' behaviors. A previous study (Harste, 1989) examined readers' behaviors through think alouds, oral retellings, and freewrites, and found similar text-related behaviors for expository texts. Moreover, that group read expository texts and included readers whose first languages varied widely, as well as native speakers of English. Future studies may wish to look at other reading-related events individually and in various combinations (e.g., think alouds, freewrites). This would allow us to search for any "purpose of reading" effect on the performance of proficient readers. Such studies would add important data on the reading behaviors of other proficient L2 readers.

Appendix

Table IV highlights the fifteen most commonly used pause mechanisms, including the amount of times each was used and, in this case, the gender of the reteller.

TABLE IV - The 15 Most Common Pause Mechanisms

| Features | Reteller number | | | | | | | | | | | | T = total | |
|-------------|-----------------|----|----|----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----------|--|
| | 01 | 02 | 03 | 04 | 05 | 06 | 07 | 08 | 09 | 10 | 11 | 12 | T | |
| pues | 5 | 0 | 31 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 12 | 1 | 73 | |
| o sea | 11 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 17 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 70 | |
| bueno | 4 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 64 | |
| eh, um | 0 | 11 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 16 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 63 | |
| entonces | 4 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 24 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 61 | |
| por ejemplo | 0 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 37 | |
| digamos | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | |
| de, de | 7 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 21 | |
| no sé/ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| que sé yo | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | |
| que, que | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 19 | |
| después | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 18 | |
| luego | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | |
| a, a | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | |
| vamo(s) | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | |
| sobretudo | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | |
| TOTAL | 34 | 28 | 77 | 47 | 111 | 33 | 17 | 16 | 57 | 22 | 29 | 35 | | |
| GENDER | M | F | F | F | M | M | F | M | M | F | F | F | | |

TABLE V RETELLING ASSESSMENT KEY

TEXT-BASED CATEGORIES

1-M = Main idea or key concept
2-D = Specific details
3-P = Paraphrasing, summarization

4-R = READER-BASED CATEGORIES - Total number of RP-type reactions

Subcategories of reader perspective:

5-RA = Intertextuality
6-RB = Verification
7-RC = Conclusions, predictions
8-RD = Critical assessment
9-RE = Generalization colored by reader (prior) knowledge, opinion, etc.

| Reader # - retelling # | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|----|----|-----|-----|----|----|----|-----|--|
| # | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | |
| | M | D | P | R: | (RA | RB | RC | RD | RE) | |
| 01-1 | 2 | 12 | 4 | 0: | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 01-2 | 5 | 27 | 7 | 3: | - | - | - | - | 3 | |
| 02-1 | 3 | 11 | 5 | 10: | - | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | |
| 02-2 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 10: | - | 6 | 1 | - | 3 | |
| 03-1 | 4 | 12 | 11 | 4: | - | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | |
| 03-2 | 3 | 16 | 23 | 8: | - | - | 4 | - | 4 | |
| 04-1 | 2 | 14 | 12 | 2: | - | 2 | - | - | - | |
| 04-2 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 2: | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | |
| 05-1 | 5 | 16 | 11 | 7: | 2 | 1 | 2 | - | 2 | |
| 05-2 | 5 | 17 | 15 | 8: | 1 | 2 | - | - | 5 | |
| 06-1 | 2 | 10 | 9 | 1: | - | - | 1 | - | - | |
| 06-2 | 4 | 13 | 7 | 0: | - | - | - | - | - | |
| 07-1 | 4 | 25 | 5 | 3: | - | - | 1 | - | 2 | |
| 07-2 | 3 | 19 | 6 | 6: | - | - | 4 | 2 | - | |
| 08-1 | 2 | 10 | 7 | 1: | - | 1 | - | - | - | |
| 08-2 | 2 | 14 | 8 | 7: | - | - | 3 | - | 4 | |
| 09-1 | 3 | 12 | 13 | 14: | - | - | 8 | 1 | 5 | |
| 09-2 | 5 | 5 | 13 | 10: | - | 1 | 4 | - | 4 | |
| 10-1 | 1 | 12 | 4 | 3: | - | 1 | - | - | 2 | |
| 10-2 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 1: | - | - | 1 | - | - | |
| 11-1 | 3 | 23 | 11 | 4: | - | - | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| 11-2 | 6 | 7 | 18 | 2: | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | |
| 12-1 | 2 | 11 | 10 | 4: | - | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | |
| 12-2 | 2 | 15 | 11 | 1: | - | - | 1 | - | - | |

References

- Babbie, E. (1982). Understanding Sociology: A Context for Action. Wadsworth Publishing Co: Belmont, CA.
- Bernhardt, E. (1983). Testing foreign language reading comprehension: The immediate recall protocol. Unterrichtspraxis 16: 27-33.
- Chandler, P., Z. Mustapha, N. Ono & C. Torruella (1989). Retellings as Assessment: Insights and patterns. Paper presented at National Reading Conference, Nov., 1989, Austin, Texas.
- Child, J. (1986). Language proficiency levels and the typology of texts. In H. Byrnes & M. Canale (Eds.), Defining and Developing Proficiency: Guidelines, Implementations and Concepts. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook.
- Dandonoli, P. (1986). ACTFL's current research in proficiency testing. In H. Byrnes & M. Canale (Eds.), Defining and Developing Proficiency: Guidelines, Implementations and Concepts. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook.
- Denzin, K. (1978). The Research Act (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Feathers, K., S. Bierman, C. Ulmer, & J. White. (1991). Understanding Understanding: Insights into the Process of Comprehension. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference, Palm Springs, CA.
- Flower, L. (1990). The role of task representaion in reading-to-write. In Flower, L., V. Stein, J. Ackerman, M. Kantz, K. McCormick & W. Peck. (Eds.). Reading-to-Write: Exploring a Cognitive and Social Process. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Garrison, B. & S. Hynds. (1991). Evocation and reflection in the reading transaction: A comparison of proficient and less proficient readers. Journal of Reading Behavior 23: 259-280.
- Glaser, B. & A. Strauss. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. New York: Academic Press.
- Goodman, K. (1990). El lenguaje integral: Un camino fácil para el desarrollo del lenguaje. Lectura y vida 11(2): 4-13.
- Goodman, Y., D. Watson & C. Burke. (1987). Reading miscue inventory: Alternative procedures. New York: Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.
- Gradman, H. & E. Hanania. (1991). Language learning background factors and ESL proficiency. Modern Language Journal 75: 39-51.
- Harste, J. (1989). Wholistic Assessment of Reading Comprehension. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference, Nov., 1989, Austin, TX.

- Irwin, P. & J. Mitchell. (1983). A Procedure for Assessing the Richness of Retellings. Journal of Reading, 26: 391-396.
- Lee, J. & Musumeci (1988). On hierarchies of reading skills and text types. Modern Language Journal 72: 173-187.
- Lincoln, Y. & E. Guba. (1985). Naturalistic Inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Ponce, C. (1990). Developing the Listening Skill in a Foreign Language. Paper presented at the Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Indianapolis, IN.
- Powell, J. (1988). An Examination of Comprehension Processes Used by Readers as They Engage in Different Forms of Assessment. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.
- Swaffar, J., K. Arens, & H. Byrnes. (1991). Reading for Meaning: An Integrated Approach to Language Learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Townsend, B. & C. Wilkie. (1983). A Comparison of Social Science Textbooks Readability and Students' Reading Levels. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Reading Forum. Sarasota, FL, Dec., 1983.